

**BEST COPY**

-IMU.

6 June 1963

59

MEMORANDUM FOR RAY CLINE

25X1A9a

SUBJECT: Attached 29 <sup>May</sup> ~~June~~ drafts on the NIS

25X1A9a

These [redacted] drafts are largely benign and no bar to maintaining course and speed but there are a couple of changes -- particularly with respect to NIS Committee chairmanship -- needing to be made before this goes to USIB.

I don't see much point in the attached Concept but there is no reason to fuss over it.

In the Direction and Management paper attached, by paragraphs :

- 1 I doubt that the DCI wants his responsibility described to this depth and probably would prefer a first sentence ending with a period after "... coordination of the NIS Program".
1. b It scarcely needs to be said that agency heads have this "primary" responsibility, and use of the term needlessly implies subordination of the NIS effort.
2. c It is doubtful if USIB wants to get into the business of establishing priorities in detail, and in any event this would be somewhat academic inasmuch as producer capabilities, annually wrestled with by the NIS Committee, tend to be a major factor. Systematic accelerated NIS production is a practical approach.
- 3 Better to say the NIS Committee "acts as a sub-committee of USIB in carrying out..." rather than "assists".

25X1A9a

Aside from perhaps implying that the [redacted] have found more need for drastic change than they evidently have found, the suggestion of a "full time" Chairman for at least 2 years, could scarcely fail to pry the Chairman loose from OBI and existing DDI and DCI command channels. There is no requirement for a Chairman more "full time" than the present one; Reber perhaps is the only other such under USIB, and in entirely different context. OBI (and therefore DDI) is so intimately and dominantly related to the Committee work and conduct of the Program that clearly the Chairmanship should stay as it is.

The grapevine says that the rotating chairmanship was favored by DIA and opposed by State; it would be out of gear with the fact that DIM produces some 60% of annual production and through OSI carries the bulk load of the Program's implementation.

- 3. b For reasons noted above, no point in recommendation to USIB on priorities; related deletion of USIB in 3. c. required.
- 3. f The Committee already reports to USIB; not only will DIA costs be a never-never and misleading matter, but there is no sound reason to uniquely lauder in public the costs of only one of the many programs in operation in the Community.
- 4. e Fuzzy and ostensibly innocuous but this could be construed to "put the NIS on notice" about "duplicating" departmental production, forgetting that the duplication may be the other way around and ignoring the important fact that NIS content may usefully serve a variety of users who would not find parochial departmental products acceptable.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] furnished me the attached on 5 June and asked me to discuss same with him, which I do not propose to do before finding your views. Perhaps you might have time to discuss on Friday (7 June). I certainly hope that [REDACTED] can be estopped from sending this to USIB with a forwarding letter that again implies the necessity for sweeping changes in the Program which in fact are not supported by these drafts.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a